

# Nomenclatural notes and typification of three synonyms of *Camellia* (Theaceae)

Dongwei Zhao<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Forestry, College of Forestry, Central South University of Forestry and Technology, 498 Shaoshan South Road, Changsha, Hunan 410004, China

Corresponding author: Dongwei Zhao ([zhaodw@csuft.edu.cn](mailto:zhaodw@csuft.edu.cn))

---

Academic editor: C. Morden | Received 3 December 2021 | Accepted 18 February 2022 | Published 15 March 2022

---

**Citation:** Zhao D (2022) Nomenclatural notes and typification of three synonyms of *Camellia* (Theaceae). *PhytoKeys* 193: 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3897/phytokeys.193.78810>

---

## Abstract

All the known generic synonyms of *Camellia* are summarized with their types clarified. *Camelliastrum* and *Desmitus* are lectotypified and *Salceda* is neotypified. “*Kailosocarpus*” and “*Parapiquetia*” were not validly published, *Theaphylla* and *Tsia* are illegitimate replacement names for *Thea*, and *Kemelia* and *Tsubaki* are illegitimate replacement names for *Camellia*. Nomenclatural notes on *Theopsis* and its type are also provided.

## Keywords

*Camellia cuspidata*, *Camellia reticulata*, *Camelliastrum*, *Desmitus*, lectotypification, neotypification, *Salceda*, *Theopsis*

## Introduction

Linnaeus (1753: 698) established the monotypic genus *Camellia* L. for the ornamental species, *Camellia japonica* L. He referenced Kaempfer’s (1712: 850, 852) description and a single illustration (Kaempfer 1712: t. 851) under *C. japonica* without citing any specimens in the protologue (Arts. 38.1, 38.5, 38.6 & 38.13 of the Shenzhen Code, Turland et al. 2018; hereafter ICN). Subsequently, Bartholomew (Jarvis et al. 1993: 29) designated the illustration (Kaempfer 1712: t. 851) as the lectotype of *C. japonica* (Art. 9 Ex. 2 of the ICN). Accordingly, this illustration serves as the type of *Camellia*.

The boundaries of *Camellia* have been gradually enlarged by several taxonomists (e.g., Sweet 1818; Seemann 1859; Sealy 1958; Chang 1981; Ming 2000). Zhang et al.



(2014) argued that *Camellia* might be a paraphyletic group in their analyses using four plastid DNA regions and the paralogous nuclear *LEAFY* marker. However, the monophyly of the genus was supported by investigations using complete plastid genome data (Yu et al. 2017) and other nuclear sequences (Vijayan et al. 2009; Li et al. 2011; Zhao et al. 2022). Nevertheless, nomenclatural problems should be resolved before a comprehensive phylogenetic study of the boundaries of *Camellia*. Although the genus, including tea, camellias and oil camellias, has been revised several times (e.g., Sealy 1958; Chang 1981; Ming 2000), the types of many taxa in *Camellia* have only recently been clarified (Zhao et al. 2017a, b, 2018, 2019; Zhao 2021). However, the types of some synonyms at generic rank remain unclear and are discussed here.

## Materials and methods

Relevant collections or their images from herbaria at A, BM, E, G, IBK, IBSC, K, KUN, L, LINN, P, PE, SBT, SYS, TCD, UPS and US (acronyms following Thiers 2022), and the taxonomic literature were examined. Types were chosen based on Arts. 9 and 10 of the ICN.

## Types of the synonyms of *Camellia*

Since the latest monograph of *Camellia* (Ming 2000), two further genera, *Bembiciopsis* H. Perrier (Judd 1997) and *Dankia* Gagnep. (Hô 1991; Zhao et al. 2017b), have been placed into the synonymy of *Camellia*. All 18 synonyms of *Camellia* (Linnaeus 1753; Adanson 1763; Blume 1825; Siebold 1832; Rafinesque 1830, 1838; Blanco 1845; Hallier 1921; Gagnepain 1939; Nakai 1940; Perrier 1940; Hu 1956, 1965) and their types (Jarvis et al. 1993; Lin et al. 2008; Zhao et al. 2016, 2017b, 2018, 2019; Zhao 2021) are listed in Table 1. “*Kailosocarpus*” (Hu 1957: 170) and “*Parapiquetia*” (Hu 1957: 170) were cited by Chang (1981: 12) in the synonymy of *Camellia*; however, both “*Kailosocarpus*” and “*Parapiquetia*” were not validly published since a Latin description or diagnosis was neither provided nor cited in each of the protologues (Art. 39.1 of the ICN). “*Kailosocarpus*” and “*Parapiquetia*” have no status under Art. 12.1 of the ICN and are, therefore, excluded from Table 1. The typification and nomenclatural notes of some synonyms of *Camellia* are elaborated below.

### 1. *Camelliastrum* Nakai, J. Jap. Bot. 16: 699. (1940)

Table 1

**Type** (“lectotype”, Art. 10 Note 1 of the ICN; designated here): *Camelliastrum caudatum* (Wall.) Nakai.



**Nomenclatural notes.** Nakai (1940) established the genus *Camelliastrum* to categorize six species in China and Japan, including *Camelliastrum assimile* (Champ. ex Benth.) Nakai, *Camelliastrum buisanense* (Sasaki) Nakai, *Camelliastrum caudatum*, *Camelliastrum gracile* (Hemsl.) Nakai, *Camelliastrum mairei* (H.Lév.) Nakai and *Camelliastrum salicifolium* (Champ.) Nakai, but did not designate a type. Based on the description in the protologue, *Camelliastrum caudatum* is selected as the type of the genus. The basionym of *Camelliastrum caudatum*, *Camellia caudata* Wall., was lectotypified by Zhao et al. (2017b: 172) as the specimen *H. Bruce s.n.* in *Wallich* 978 (right-hand specimen of K001110475. An image is available at <http://www.kew.org/herbcatimg/680707.jpg>). Therefore, this specimen becomes the type of *Camelliastrum* (Art. 10.1 of the ICN).

## 2. *Desmitus* Raf., *Sylva Tellur.* 139. (1838)

Table 1

**Type.** *Desmitus reticulata* (Lindl.) Raf.  $\equiv$  *Camellia reticulata* Lindl., Bot. Reg. 13: t. 1078 (1827).

**Lectotype** (designated here): Lindl., Bot. Reg. 13: t. 1078 (1827).

**Nomenclatural notes.** Rafinesque (1838) established the monotypic genus *Desmitus* for *D. reticulata*. This was a new combination based on *C. reticulata* because he referenced the basionym by the words “Camel. do bot. reg. 1978...”. However, the taxon number cited by Rafinesque (1838: 140) is incorrect, but should be recognized as a correctable typographical error of “1078” and so does not prohibit the valid publication of the new combination (Art. 41.3 of the ICN). Nevertheless, Lindley (1827: t. 1078) described *C. reticulata* based on the living plants that bore semidouble flowers and introduced from China. No specimen was cited in the protologue of *C. reticulata*. The coloured drawing, t. 1078, was accompanied by the protologue and therefore designated as the lectotype of *C. reticulata*. Accordingly, the drawing serves as the type of *Desmitus* (Art. 10.1 of the ICN).

## 3. *Salceda* Blanco, *Fl. Filip. ed. 2:* 374. (1845)

Table 1

**Type.** *Salceda montana* Blanco

**Neotype** (designated here): Philippines. Luzon: Bulacan, Angat, February 1919, *Ramos & Edaño* 34071 (K!; isoneotypes: BM!, P04511451 [the image is available at <https://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p04511451>]!, and US 00113902 [the image is available at <http://n2t.net/ark:/65665/3e093c26d-7aa1-4494-8723-989167baf8ba>]!).



**Nomenclatural notes.** Blanco (1845: 374) established the monotypic genus *Salceda* for *S. montana*. Merrill (1905: 21) transferred the species to *Thea* as *T. montana* (Blanco) Merr. and stated that “Blanco’s specimens were from Angat, Province of Bulacan”. However, the types of Blanco’s species were suggested to be either all destroyed (Merrill 1905: 6) or no longer extant (Merrill 1918: 5). I also failed to find the original material of *S. montana*. Based on the protologue (Blanco 1845: 374), a specimen collected from the same locality, *Ramos & Edaño 34071* (K), is designated as the neotype of *S. montana* because it bears flower fragments and seeds on the sheet.

**Table 1.** A summary of synonyms of *Camellia* L.

| Synonym   | Type, as species (basionym)             | Type, as specimen or illustration  | Notes   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <i>Bembiciopsis</i> H. Perrier, Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat. 13: 300. (1940)        | <i>Bembiciopsis uniflora</i> H. Perrier | <i>Le Myre de Vilers s.n.</i> , P00389083, holotype  |   |
| <i>Calpandria</i> Blume, Bijdr. fl. Ned. Ind. 178. (1825)                         | <i>Calpandria lanceolata</i> Blume      | L 0064294, lectotype (designated by Zhao et al. 2019: 298)   |   |
| <i>Camelliastrum</i> Nakai, J. Jap. Bot. 16: 699. (1940)                          | <i>Camellia caudata</i> Wall.           | <i>H. Bruce s.n.</i> in <i>Wallich 978</i> (K001110475, right-hand specimen), lectotype (designated by Zhao et al. 2017b: 172) |   |
| <i>Dankia</i> Gagnep. in Humbert, Fl. Indo-Chine, Suppl. 1: 198. (1939)           | <i>Dankia langbianensis</i> Gagnep.     | <i>Poilane 18648</i> (P00754831), lectotype (designated by Zhao et al. 2017b: 173)   |   |
| <i>Desmitus</i> Raf., Sylva Tellur. 139. (1838)                                   | <i>Camellia reticulata</i> Lindl.       | Lindl., Bot. Reg. 13: t. 1078 (1827), lectotype, designated in this paper  |   |
| <i>Drupifera</i> Raf., Sylva Tellur. 140. (1838)                                  | <i>Thea oleosa</i> Lour.                | <i>Loureiro s.n.</i> (P00150891), holotype   |   |
| <i>Glyptocarpa</i> Hu, Acta Phytotax. Sin. 10: 25. (1965)                         | <i>Pyrenaria camellioides</i> Hu        | <i>Wang 72468</i> (PE 00024548), lectotype (designated by Lin et al. 2008: 1701)   |   |
| <i>Kemelia</i> Raf., Sylva Tellur. 139. (1838)                                    | <i>Camellia japonica</i> L.             | Kaempfer, Amoen. Exot. Fasc. t. 851. (1712), lectotype   | Illegitimate replacement name for <i>Camellia</i> |
| <i>Piquetia</i> (Pierre) Hallier f., Beih. Bot. Centralbl. 39(2): 162. (1921)     | <i>Thea piquetiana</i> Pierre           | <i>Pierre 1708</i> (P01903371), lectotype (designated by Zhao et al. 2018: 94)   |   |
| <i>Salceda</i> Blanco, Fl. Filip. ed. 2: 374. (1845)                              | <i>Salceda montana</i> Blanco           | <i>Ramos &amp; Edaño 34071</i> (K), neotype, designated in this paper  |   |
| <i>Sasanqua</i> T. Ness in Siebold, Nippon 2(6): 13. (1832)                       | <i>Camellia sasanqua</i> Thunb.         | <i>Thunberg s.n.</i> (UPS No. 16143, left-hand specimen), lectotype (designated by Zhao 2021: 297)                             |   |
| <i>Stereocarpus</i> (Pierre) Hallier f., Beih. Bot. Centralbl. 39(2): 162. (1921) | <i>Thea dormoyana</i>                   | The author and typification of the species is dependent on a binding decision to be made, see Zhao et al. (2016: 1183)         |   |
| <i>Thea</i> L., Sp. Pl. 515. (1753)   | <i>Thea sinensis</i> L.                 | Kaempfer, Amoen. Exot. Fasc. 606, f. 1–2. (1712), lectotype (designated by Bartholomew in Jarvis et al. 1993: 93)              |   |
| <i>Theaphylla</i> Raf., Med. Fl. 2: 267. (1830)                                   | <i>Thea sinensis</i> L.                 | Kaempfer, Amoen. Exot. Fasc. 606, f. 1–2. (1712), lectotype  | Illegitimate replacement name for <i>Thea</i>     |
| <i>Theopsis</i> (Cohen-Stuart) Nakai, J. Jap. Bot. 16: 704. (1940)                | <i>Thea cuspidata</i> Kochs             | <i>Henry 7026</i> (K000380525), lectotype (designated by Sealy 1958: 57)   |   |
| <i>Tsia</i> Adans., Fam. Pl. 2: 450. (1763)                                       | <i>Thea sinensis</i> L.                 | Kaempfer, Amoen. Exot. Fasc. 606, f. 1–2. 1712, lectotype  | Illegitimate replacement name for <i>Thea</i>     |
| <i>Tsubaki</i> Adans., Fam. Pl. 2: 399. (1763)                                    | <i>Camellia japonica</i> L.             | Kaempfer, Amoen. Exot. Fasc. t. 851. 1712, lectotype   | Illegitimate replacement name for <i>Camellia</i> |
| <i>Yunnanea</i> Hu, Acta Phytotax. Sin. 5: 282. (1956)                            | <i>Yunnanea xylocarpa</i> Hu            | <i>Yu 16021</i> (PE 00133872), lectotype (designated by Lin et al. 2008: 1702)   |   |



### Illegitimate replacement names for *Camellia* and *Thea*

*Thea* L., a genus established by Linnaeus (1753: 515) for tea (*T. sinensis* L., currently *C. sinensis* [L.] Kuntze), was treated as a synonym of *Camellia* by Sweet (1818: 157). *Theaphylla* Raf. and *Tsia* Adans. are illegitimate replacement names for *Thea* because *Thea* was cited in the synonymies of them (Adanson 1763: 613; Rafinesque 1830: 267), which makes *Tsia* and *Theaphylla* nomenclaturally superfluous (Arts. 6.11, 52.1 & 52.2[e] of the ICN). Similarly, *Kemelia* Raf. and *Tsubaki* Adans. are illegitimate replacement names for *Camellia* (Adanson 1763: 399; Rafinesque 1838: 139) because *Camellia* was cited as a synonym of them (Arts. 6.11, 52.1 & 52.2[e] of the ICN). Therefore, the four names, *Kemelia*, *Theaphylla*, *Tsia* and *Tsubaki*, are rejected under Art. 52.1 of the ICN.

### Nomenclatural notes on *Theopsis*

Cohen-Stuart (1916: 70) established *Camellia* sect. *Theopsis* Cohen-Stuart in his Ph.D. thesis, which constituted an effective publication under Art. 30.9 of the ICN. Subsequently, he translated the first two chapters of his original thesis in Dutch into English and published it (Cohen-Stuart 1919). Cohen-Stuart (1916, 1919) listed nine species, viz. *C. costei* H. Lév., *C. cuspidata* (Kochs) hort., *C. euryoides* Lindl., *C. forrestii* (Diels) Cohen-Stuart, *C. henryana* Cohen-Stuart, *C. lutchuensis* T. Itô ex T. Itô & Matsum., *C. parvifolia* (Hayata) Cohen-Stuart, *C. punctata* (Kochs) Cohen-Stuart and *C. rosiflora* Hook., in the key under sect. *Theopsis*. These nine species are presumably treated as the members of sect. *Theopsis* based on the structure of the key, the description of the section and the discussion. However, Cohen-Stuart (1916, 1919) did not designate a type for his sect. *Theopsis*. Nakai (1940) raised this section to generic rank to include 14 species and cited Cohen-Stuart's (1919) English article (Arts. 41.1 & 41.3 of the ICN), but without selecting a type for the genus. Remarkably, four of nine species of Cohen-Stuart's (1916, 1919) sect. *Theopsis* were excluded and five of them, including *C. euryoides*, *C. forrestii*, *C. lutchuensis*, *C. parvifolia*, and *C. rosiflora* (= *C. maliflora*, according to Cohen-Stuart 1916: 69, 1919: 241), were retained in the genus *Theopsis* (Cohen-Stuart) Nakai. Later, Sealy (1958: 14) treated *Theopsis* as a synonym of *Camellia* and resumed sect. *Theopsis* (Sealy 1958: 48). Chang (1981: 128) followed Sealy's (1958) treatment and designated *C. cuspidata*, a species excluded from Nakai's genus *Theopsis*, as the type of sect. *Theopsis* and this typification must be followed under Art. 10.5 of the ICN. However, when Nakai (1940) adopted *Theopsis* as a generic name, he did not exclude the type of Cohen-Stuart's (1916: 70) sect. *Theopsis* because the section had not yet been typified, so Arts. 48.1 & 48.2 of the ICN do not apply. According to Art. 48.1 Note 1 of the ICN, this situation should be dealt with under Art. 7.3 of the ICN. Therefore, the genus *Theopsis* is typified by the type of its basionym, sect. *Theopsis*, that is, *C. cuspidata*, based on Chang's (1981: 128) typification (Art. 10.5 of the ICN) even though the species was excluded from this genus (Art. 7.3 of the ICN).

However, *C. cuspidata* has nomenclatural problems. Kochs (1900: 586) described *T. cuspidata* Kochs and cited the single gathering *Henry 7026*. Subsequently, a name,



*C. cuspidata*, was provided in the list of “Awards of Merit” in *The Gardeners’ Chronicle* (Anonymous 1912: 228). The plant was described as having “small, single, white flowers” with “pale-yellow stamens” and “narrow leaves” that were about 2–2.5 inches long. The brief description could make *C. cuspidata* validly published as a new species because the requirements of Arts. 32.1 & 38.1 of the ICN are likely fulfilled (also see Art. 38 Note 2 of the ICN). However, although Kochs’s *T. cuspidata* was neither directly nor indirectly referenced in the protologue of *C. cuspidata* (Anonymous 1912: 228; Arts. 41.1–41.3 of the ICN), the latter is, nevertheless, treated as a new combination based on *T. cuspidata* under Art. 41.4 (see Ex. 12) of the ICN.

Furthermore, two duplicates of *Henry 7026* were found at K and US, viz. K000380525 (the image is available at <http://www.kew.org/herbcatimg/165067.jpg>) and US 00504123 (the image is available at <http://n2t.net/ark:/65665/308ec5722-d414-4a4d-b733-f34c3778997b>). Since Kochs (1900: 586) did not indicate a single specimen of the entire gathering as the holotype, the two duplicates at different herbaria are syntypes of *T. cuspidata* based on Art. 40 Note 1. When Sealy (1958: 57) cited “*A. Henry 7026* (K, type-number)” under *C. cuspidata*, the citation could be treated as the lectotypification of the species following Arts. 7.11, 9.10 & 9.19 of the ICN. Therefore, the lectotype of *C. cuspidata* is that of *T. cuspidata*, viz. *Henry 7026* (K000380525), which, in turn, serves as the type of *Theopsis* (Table 1).

## Acknowledgements

I thank the staff of herbaria consulted for making specimens and literature available, and three reviewers and the editor, Dr. Clifford Morden, for their careful comments and corrections. The work was funded by the Scientific Research Foundation of the Central South University of Forestry and Technology (2019YJ023).

## References

- Adanson M (1763) *Familles des Plantes*. Chez Vincent, Paris, 640 pp.
- Anonymous (1912) *Camellia cuspidata*. *The Gardeners’ Chronicle* 51(1319): 228.
- Blanco FM (1845) *Flora de Filipinas: Segun el Sistema Sexual de Linneo*. Impr. de M. Sanchez, Manila, 619 pp. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.48447>
- Blume CL (1825) *Bijdragen tot de Flora van Nederlandsch Indië*, stuk 1. Ter Lands Drukkerij, Batavia, 284 pp. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.115427>
- Chang HT (1981) *A Taxonomy of the Genus Camellia*. The Editorial Staff of the Journal of Sun Yatsen University, Guangzhou, 180 pp.
- Cohen-Stuart CP (1916) *Voorbereidende Onderzoekingen ten Dienste van de Selektie der Theeplant*. Druk van J.H. de Bussy, Amsterdam, 328 pp.
- Cohen-Stuart CP (1919) *A basis for tea selection*. *Bulletin du Jardin Botanique de Buitenzorg* 1: 193–320.



- Gagnepain F (1939) Bixacées. In: Humbert H (Ed.) Supplément a la Flore Générale de l'Indo-Chine (Vol. 1). Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, 198–213.
- Hallier H (1921) Beiträge zur kenntnis der Linaceae (DC. 1819) Dumort. Beihefte zum Botanischen Centralblatt 39: 1–178.
- Hô PH (1991) Cây cỏ Việt Nam (Vol. 1). Mekong Printing, Santa Ana, 618 pp.
- Hu HH (1956) *Sinopyrenaria* and *Yunnanea*, two new genera of Theaceae from Yunnan, China. Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 5(4): 279–283.
- Hu HH (1957) *Kailosocarpus* and *Parapiquetia*, two new genera of Theaceae from Yunnan. Chinese Science Bulletin 2(6): e170.
- Hu HH (1965) *Glyptocarpa* a new genus of Theaceae. Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica 10(1): 25–26.
- Jarvis CE, Barrie FR, Allan DM, Reveal JL (1993) A list of Linnaean generic names and their types. Regnum Vegetabile 127: 1–100.
- Judd WS (1997) The Flacourtiaceae in the Southeastern United States. Harvard Papers in Botany 1(10): 65–79. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41761527>
- Kaempfer E (1712) Amoenitatum Exoticarum Politico-physico-medicarum Fasciculi V. Typis & Impensis Henrici Wilhelmi Meyeri, Aulæ Lippiacæ Typographi, Lemgoviae, 912 pp. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.147012>
- Kochs J (1900) Über die Gattung *Thea* und den chinesischen Thee. In: Engler A (Ed.) Botanische Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte und Pflanzengeographie. Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, 577–635.
- Li R, Yang JB, Yang SX, Li DZ (2011) Phylogeny and taxonomy of the *Pyrenaria* complex (Theaceae) based on nuclear ribosomal ITS sequences. Nordic Journal of Botany 29(6): 780–787. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-1051.2011.01175.x>
- Lin Q, Bei SQ, Li HL, Yang SX, Yang ZR (2008) Lectotypifications of thirty-three names of Chinese taxa in Theaceae. Acta Botanica Boreali-Occidentalia Sinica 28(8): 1695–1703.
- Lindley J (1827) *Camellia reticulata*. In: Edwards S (Ed.) Botanical Register; Consisting of Coloured Figures of Exotic Plants Cultivated in British Gardens; with Their History and Mode of Treatment. James Ridgway, London, 1078 pp.
- Linnaeus C (1753) Species Plantarum. Impensis Laurentii Salvii, Holmiae, 1200 pp. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.669>
- Merrill ED (1905) A review of the identifications of the species described in Blanco's Flora de Filipinas. Philippines. Bureau of Government Laboratories 27: 1–132. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.58554>
- Merrill ED (1918) Species Blancoanae. Bureau of Printing, Manila, 423 pp.
- Ming TL (2000) Monograph of the Genus *Camellia*. Yunnan Science and Technology Press, Kunming, 352 pp.
- Nakai T (1940) A new classification of the Sino-Japanese genera and species which belong to the tribe Camellieae (II). The Journal of Japanese Botany 16(12): 691–708.
- Perrier H (1940) Revision des flacourtiacées de Madagascar et des Comores. Memoires du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle 13(3): 261–302.
- Rafinesque CS (1830) Medical Flora; or Manual of the Medical Botany of the United States of North America (Vol. 2). Samuel C. Atkinson, Philadelphia, 276 pp.
- Rafinesque CS (1838) Sylva Telluriana: Mantis Synoptica. Printed for the author and publisher, Philadelphia, 184 pp. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.248>



- Sealy JR (1958) A Revision of the Genus *Camellia*. The Royal Horticultural Society, London, 239 pp.
- Seemann B (1859) Synopsis of the genera *Camellia* and *Thea*. Transactions of the Linnean Society of London 22(4): 337–352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1096-3642.1856.tb00103.x>
- Siebold PFv (1832) Nippon: Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan (Vol. 2, pt. 6). C.C. van der Hoek, Leyden, 19 pp.
- Sweet R (1818) Hortus Suburbanus Londinensis. Printed for James Ridgway, London, 242 pp. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.109914>
- Thiers B (2022) Index Herbariorum: A global directory of public herbaria and associated staff. New York Botanical Garden's Virtual Herbarium. <http://sweetgum.nybg.org/science/ih/> [accessed 8 February 2022]
- Turland NJ, Wiersema JH, Barrie FR, Greuter W, Hawksworth DL, Herendeen PS, Knapp S, Kusber WH, Li DZ, Marhold K, May TW, McNeill J, Monro AM, Prado J, Price MJ, Smith GF (2018) International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Shenzhen Code) adopted by the Nineteenth International Botanical Congress Shenzhen, China, July 2017. Regnum Vegetabile 159. Koeltz Botanical Books, Glashütten, 254 pp. <https://doi.org/10.12705/Code.2018>
- Vijayan K, Zhang WJ, Tsou CH (2009) Molecular taxonomy of *Camellia* (Theaceae) inferred from nrITS sequences. American Journal of Botany 96(7): 1348–1360. <https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.0800205>
- Yu XQ, Gao LM, Soltis DE, Soltis PS, Yang JB, Fang L, Yang SX, Li DZ (2017) Insights into the historical assembly of East Asian subtropical evergreen broadleaved forests revealed by the temporal history of the tea family. New Phytologist 215(3): 1235–1248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14683>
- Zhang W, Kan SL, Zhao H, Li ZY, Wang XQ (2014) Molecular phylogeny of tribe Theae (Theaceae s.s.) and its implications for generic delimitation. PLoS ONE 9(5): e98133. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0098133>
- Zhao DW (2021) Typification of *Camellia sasanqua* (Theaceae). Phytotaxa 491(4): 297–300. <https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.491.4.5>
- Zhao DW, Hodkinson TR, Parnell JAN (2022) Phylogenetics based on three nuclear regions and its implications for systematics and evolutionary history of global *Camellia* (Theaceae). Journal of Systematics and Evolution. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jse.12837>
- Zhao DW, Parnell JAN, Dubéarnès A (2016) Requests for binding decisions on the descriptive statements associated with *Thea dormoyana* and *T. piquetiana*. Taxon 65(5): e1183. <https://doi.org/10.12705/655.29>
- Zhao DW, Parnell JAN, Hodkinson TR (2017a) Names of Assam tea: Their priority, typification and nomenclatural notes. Taxon 66(6): 1447–1455. <https://doi.org/10.12705/666.11>
- Zhao DW, Parnell JAN, Hodkinson TR (2017b) Typification of names in the genus *Camellia* (Theaceae). Phytotaxa 292(2): 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.292.2.4>
- Zhao DW, Parnell JAN, Hodkinson TR (2018) Typification of names in *Camellia* (Theaceae), II. Phytotaxa 351(1): 93–95. <https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.351.1.9>
- Zhao DW, Parnell JAN, Hodkinson TR (2019) Typification of names in *Camellia* (Theaceae), III. Phytotaxa 415(5): 298–300. <https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.415.5.7>